PROPOSAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET (INDIVIDUAL)

EVALUATION FACTOR: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES PLAN (RATED)

PROPOSER: Keolis

DATE: 9/6/2013

OVERALL RATING: A

NARRATIVE SUMMARY: There are a few sections that seem to lack completeness, especially later in this section. The claim of innovation is overstated. This is fundamentally sound and as an outsider you can expect generalities. The overview is more informative than some of the latter sections. Overall it seems the job can be done. Keolis needs context from MBTA and MBCR to succeed in mobilization and sustaining the environment.

Objective:

The following are the objectives for the Information Technology Service Plan evaluation factor:

1) To identify Proposers that demonstrate ability to operate a professional information technology (IT) organization that follows and complies with industry best practices, uses metrics to monitor and improve performance, and successfully operates, maintains, and upgrades the full suite of IT systems and elements needed for delivery of the Commuter Rail Operating Agreement services and the Commuter Rail IT Environment;

2) To identify Proposers with experience complying with standards and best practices including PCI-DSS (Payment Card Industry-Data Security Standard);

3) To identify Proposers with a proven approach to sharing data and system access with customer/agency management in a timely fashion to support contract oversight and planning functions; and

4) To identify Proposers with a high level of ability (i) assessing and managing risks within a complex IT organization involving legacy components and new technology, and (ii) finding creative solutions to ensure efficient and uninterrupted operations.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET (INDIVIDUAL)

EVALUATION FACTOR: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES PLAN (RATED)

Evaluation Criteria:

The Proposer has demonstrated the ability to develop, implement, operate, maintain and upgrade an IT organization and related systems and elements, all in compliance with industry best practices. The Proposer has demonstrated its experience in complying with various best practices including, but not limited to, PCI-DSS. Furthermore, the Proposer has demonstrated reliable approaches to ensuring full data and system access with agency management to ensure proper oversight and monitoring, as well as the ability to ensure efficient and interrupted operations consisting of both legacy systems and new technology.

Instructions:

Evaluators must rate each requirement outlined in the table below as one of the following: (i) Exceptional; (ii) Good; (iii) Acceptable; (iv) Potential to Become Acceptable; or (v) Unacceptable. Please note the following explanations when rating each requirement:

1) A rating of Exceptional is appropriate when the Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to significantly exceed stated criteria in a way that is beneficial to the MBTA. This rating indicates a consistently outstanding level of quality, with very little or no risk that this Proposer would fail to meet the requirements of the solicitation. There are no weaknesses.

2) A rating of Good is appropriate when the Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to exceed stated criteria. This rating indicates a generally better than acceptable quality, with little risk that this Proposer would fail to meet the requirements of the solicitation. Weaknesses, if any, are very minor. Correction of the weaknesses would not be necessary before the Proposal would be considered further.

3) A rating of Acceptable is appropriate if the Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to meet the stated criteria. This rating indicates an acceptable level of quality. The Proposal demonstrates a reasonable probability of success. Weaknesses exist but can be readily corrected through requests for Clarification or Communications.

4) A rating of Potential to Become Acceptable is appropriate if the Proposer has demonstrated an approach that fails to meet stated criteria as there are weaknesses, but they are susceptible to correction through Discussions. The response is

considered marginal in terms of the basic content and/or amount of information provided for evaluation, but overall the Proposer is capable of providing an acceptable or better Proposal.

5) A rating of Unacceptable is appropriate if the Proposer has demonstrated an approach that indicates significant weaknesses and/or unacceptable quality. The Proposal fails to meet the stated criteria and/or lacks essential information and is conflicting and/or unproductive. There is no reasonable likelihood of success; weaknesses are so major and/or extensive that a major revision to the Proposal would be necessary.

Ratings for each requirement must be recorded in the associated Rating column, and a detailed explanation of why a particular rating was given to a requirement must be recorded in the associated Comments/Justification for Rating column. The Appendix B Section column identifies relevant sections of Appendix B (Operations and Management Proposal Instructions) to the Instructions to Proposers.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET (INDIVIDUAL)

EVALUATION FACTOR: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES PLAN (RATED)

Requirement No.	Appendix B Section	Requirement	Rating	Comments/Justification for Rating
1.	B10.2(A)	The Proposer shall provide an Information Technology Services Plan that describes in detail the Proposer's approach to providing the IT services described in the Contract including, but not limited to, Schedule 3.16 (Information Technology Requirements) of the Commuter Rail Operating Agreement. Elements of that Plan shall include, but not be limited to, proposed approaches to the following: 1. Delivering application and data interfaces; 2. Maintaining source code escrow; 3. Sustaining and/or transitioning the existing IT environment during mobilization; 4. Replacing and upgrading IT systems to keep the same in a state of good repair; 5. Tracking and escalating issues; 6. Understanding and utilizing new technologies such as RFID (radio frequency identification);	**(iii) A**	**1. Nothing *too* specific, ISO quality is a major commitment, this would have value. The documentation and other details cover the requirement. There is mention and a clear understanding that these interfaces are for improving information sharing with MBTA.** **2. Escrow as described is a standard approach and meets all requirements. A third party is required to make it an actual escrow agreement.** **3. Despite some over simplifications most salient points are covered. There could be a greater emphasis on QA. Training is covered and will be critical. There is no mention of leveraging current IT employees at the incumbent. This could be more specific. The sourcing section is silent on this as well.** **4. This section is cautious and for good reason. There is a lot to learn and although it is not stated the complexity of this transition is implied in the imperative. They will determine the status of every system, a very good idea before committing too much.** **5. The choice of the ServiceNow tool is sound decision. The idea of sending Alerts to Dispatch off-hours is a good idea if the dispatchers are trained and agreeable.** **6. It seems to promise a lot, hard to rate. I do not think IT needs to lead the innovation, but support and guide it. NFC is mentioned as an innovation and there is currently no use of NFC in the U.S.**

PROPOSAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET (INDIVIDUAL)

EVALUATION FACTOR: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES PLAN (RATED)

Requirement No.	Appendix B Section	Requirement	Rating	Comments/Justification for Rating
		7. Documenting the IT environment; 8. Managing an IT organization and staff; 9. Conducting regular reviews and meetings with the MBTA; 10. Complying with MBTA and other applicable standards; 11. Applying sound change management, project management, and configuration management practices; 12. Operating an IT service center and responding to and repairing reported problems; 13. Performing root cause analyses; 14. Developing and implementing IT asset lifecycle plans; 15. Implementing a quality assurance program; 16. Performing monitoring and reporting		**7. Meets requirements, not much new in the way of ideas. They show experience as demonstrated by the numbering system referenced. ISO 9001 will be a heavy lift. I am surprised they did not mention using ServiceNow as a repository for certain knowledge bases.** **8. Completely in-sourced the help desk which seems unnecessary. The Security position should be higher up. After mobilization this is close. Not sure they know the IT market in Boston.** **9. Meets requirements. Need to discuss the MBTA participants as there are assumptions here that are probably incorrect.** **10. Need to understand the PCI-DSS regulations. Up front audit is a good idea and sound practice. We need them to follow standards required in the contract, not our own. This could be a misunderstanding.** **11. Lacks any depth on change management and does not mention the ITIL support is ServiceNow to enable it. Surprised that they discuss items without mentioning the solution. Lots of generic framework, it does not demonstrate any ability to execute on it.** **12. Large gap: no mention of call recording. This is bold on page 416. Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery are described in this section and are described in elegant best practice terms and pictures. Gives very little demonstration or detail of Service Center in this section.**

Requirement No.	Appendix B Section	Requirement	Rating	Comments/Justification for Rating
		of performance of IT functions and complying with service level agreements; 17. Providing appropriate and timely access to MBTA to Operator IT staff and systems; and 18. Negotiating and managing contracts with IT suppliers responsibly and by seeking the best value at all times.		**13. Not much detail and seems to fit requirements. They do mention ServiceNow as an enabler.** **14. Covers the requirement. SDLC seems an odd fit for discussing systems, it is usually for the software development, just my observation. ROI is mentioned and that is a good sign. Lifecycle management requires practical solutions that are affordable. All lifecycle issues are not simple. Try replacing a train control system!** **15. There are some contextual issues with this section. It is not well written and generalized. This should be clarified. The ideas are there and should be more coherent and specific.** **16. The service catalog framework is clear. It is an excellent approach to organizing around service and the customer. The requirements are met.** **17. Lacking any detail. Could be an area that requires further discussion.** **18. Not much in this section and mentioned in other sections. Boilerplate?**
2.	B10.2(B)	The Proposer shall: (i) identify those portions of the information that it provided in response to B9.2(A)(1) – (18) of Appendix B that it considers to be innovative, best practice, beneficial to MBTA Customers and/or cost efficient, and (ii) submit information supporting or otherwise validating its position that said portions are innovative, best practice, beneficial to MBTA Customers	**(iii) A**	**This section has a long list and is well organized. It is a stretch to call some of these innovations as such. ServiceNow is a good choice and is innovative if it is implemented and used properly. Selecting it is not an innovation. They have covered many best practices especially ISO 9001, which is a heavy lift. There is nothing in this section that is outside the IT box.**

PROPOSAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET (INDIVIDUAL)

EVALUATION FACTOR: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES PLAN (RATED)

Requirement No.	Appendix B Section	Requirement	Rating	Comments/Justification for Rating
		and/or cost efficient.		

#25368515_v1

10/30/2013